

**Science
and
Religion
Agree!**

MILTON JENKINS JONES



Science and Religion Agree!

By
MILTON JENKINS JONES



THE DESERET NEWS PRESS

1949

Elder Gerwin Bowen

Copyright 1949
by
Milton Jenkins Jones

Published by
CHURCH SERVICE Co.
Salt Lake City, Utah

There is no mystery throughout the whole plan of salvation, only to those who do not understand.

. . . BRIGHAM YOUNG

CONTENTS

I. Vexing Controversies	5
II. Time Involved in Creation	7
III. The Order of Creation	9
IV. The Method Used in Creation	16
V. The Governing Force of Creation	19

Published by
Claremont Publishers Co.
San Jose, Calif., U.S.A.

I

A FIELD OF DISAGREEMENT

MANY of us have been aware that for generations past, there have been conflicts between "science" and "religion." The interpretations which have for so long a time been placed upon certain scriptural statements, haven't seemed to agree with some of the discoveries of science,—at least not with the conclusions reached from the study of these discoveries.

In this writing, we have in mind a *particular* field in which there has been pronounced and vigorous disagreement: the Creation—especially the *method* which God used to fill the earth with its life, and the *length of time* it took Him to do it.

Many of those who depend mostly upon Holy Writ for their information, claim that if God created each animal, and if each animal remained in the sphere in which God placed it, then evolution is a false theory, and should not be tolerated.

On the other hand, those who depend mostly upon science (or at least try to arrive at an agreement between science and religion), feel that God could have created—or organized—life upon the earth by the process we now call evolution, as well as by any other method. They say that God can do whatever seems best to Him, and is not limited in His activities by anything which man is presently aware of. After all, our eyes and ears and reasoning, they tell us, should be used to some extent, and these organs of sense, as well as our power to think, tell us that all life is continually changing all around us, and that is precisely what evolution is: change and growth.

This, then, is one controversy to be considered in these pages.

The other controversy to be considered here is that over the length of time involved in the Creation, and can be summed up as follows:

The Bible gives us a story of the creation of the earth, which mentions six days as the time required to complete it. Some have thought that this account in Genesis was of the mortal creation only, and that the days spoken of were of definite and equal length, which length of time was equal to one thousand of our years, as we now measure time on earth. Thus, the earth must have been created in just six thousand years.

Now, in later years, scientific findings and conclusions seem to indicate that the formation of the earth was begun hundreds of millions of years ago, and that the first life was either placed or spontaneously generated here well over one hundred million years ago.

It is immediately apparent that if the earth and all its life was organized in only six thousand years, then the methods which have been developed by science for measuring past time, are completely erroneous. These two interpretations — the one of Holy Writ, and the other of natural phenomena—are in complete disagreement with each other.

These two great areas of disagreement have caused great confusion, and have led to violent arguments, legal battles, apostasy, and even physical and armed conflict, as well as suicide.

Now, this writer has seen some of the confusion and conflict resulting from disagreement between scientific and religious conclusions, and as a result of an earnest attempt to find the answers to at least some of the problems involved, has found some interesting facts and inferences which he would like to share with the reader.

FIRST OF ALL, let us remember that religion is a very subjective thing. That is, our emotions are involved, and we accept or reject what we are told or what we read, on the basis of how we, personally and individually, *feel* about it. A man often accepts or rejects a religious doctrine or assertion because of his innermost *convictions* concerning it, often not being certain just where these convictions came from.

Science, on the other hand, is objective. That is, a fact is observed, we'll say, by a human eye, but it is *verified* by not only other human eyes, but by instruments which are as exact as man can make them. For example, the offspring of a horse—or any other animal—is observed to be different in some respect from the parent. But this observation is not enough; scientific measurements must be applied, in order to determine in what way, and in what degree the offspring differs from the parents, and what caused the difference. To science, observation alone is only a part of the process of finding facts. There must be verification by accepted, objective standards.

Many branches of science have suffered the ill-will and suspicion of many religious men because some of the inferences from facts have seemed to lead men from their God. But science is simply another group of methods of getting at the same problems that the religious men are confronted with; it is a way of searching for truth, too. Mistakes in interpretations have been made, yes—many of them, but religious men, too, have made mistakes. Those who search for truth in the laboratories of nature, and those who search for truth in the writings of divinely inspired men, are all human beings, and human beings make mistakes.

In this present article, we are, as the title suggests, going to present some reasons—and some evidence—supporting the proposition that the only conflicts between science and religion have been, and are, in the minds of some men, not in the facts: not in the truth of the matter. Our particular case in point, of course, is the creation of life upon the earth, and we will discuss it under the following headings: *The time of the Creation, The Order of the Creation, The Method of the Creation, and The Creator.*

II

HOW LONG DID IT TAKE TO CREATE THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH?

MANY of us have long thought that the creation was completed in six days, and that these days were of a definite and equal length, even with time out for darkness. Thus, in our minds, the creation has been divided into definite and complete (in themselves) acts or combinations of acts. Our ideas seem to have been that the earth was formed and then left more or less suspended in time and space while the heavens were formed, then these in turn put to one side while other acts of creation were going on, and so on until Adam became mortal. Of course, we have not *consciously* built up such a theory, but nevertheless, we seem not to have consciously pictured the creation as a constantly continuous process. In other words, we seem not to have built up a mental picture which would allow one group of life to continue growing and expanding while the next group was being organized.

When we read of the creation of the Second Day (or Period of Time), for example, we seem not to keep in mind that the creations of the first period were still in existence, and that those of the second period were dependent upon—at least in part—those of the first.

In addition, we seem to have further categorized the steps of the creation and have tended to impress ourselves with the “days” of the creation as being definite periods of time, with specific and exact lengths, e.g., 1000 years.

Now, as a matter of fact, the ancient Hebrew word from which was translated the Biblical “day,” means simply a period of time, and—as used in the Bible—it *does not always mean the same length of time!* (See Widtsoe, *Evidences and Reconciliations*, p 135)

From the outset, then, the Bible doesn't give us the length of time of the days of the creations, and neither does modern scripture. Even the Lord's day of 1000 of man's years, as spoken of in the Book of Abraham, is not necessarily the same day as that spoken of in the Genesis account of creation—at least there is no *unquestioned* evidence that it is.

Even more important, however, than the correct translation of terms, is the fact that *the Bible does not say that the mortal creation WAS accomplished in six days, or even in six periods of time ! !* Nor does any other scripture say so!

Let's examine these writings—*closely*.

IN THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS, we have an account of the creations of the heavens and of the earth, with the life upon the earth. However, in the second chapter, 4th and 5th verses, we read: “These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, and *every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew*: for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground.” We find a similar report in the Book of Moses.¹

¹Moses 3:5

The creation stories in Genesis and in Moses tell first of a spiritual organization of materials, and then tell plainly that *after* the spiritual formation—which took six periods of time—the mortal creation was accomplished. (See Talmage, *Articles of Faith*, p 491)

How Long Did It Take For the Mortal Creation?

In the accounts of the spiritual creation, the term “day” is used to categorize each of the major steps, but is dropped when the account of the mortal creation is presented; at least it is used only once, to denote but *one* period of time for the *entire* creation: “in *the* day that I, the Lord God, made the heaven and the earth.”² The spiritual creation, then, may have been accomplished in six successive periods of time, and, as clearly stated in Abraham,³ the mortal creation *planned* during six successive periods of planning, but the world, when it was formed as we see it about us now, was done so in *one* continuous process and, obviously, is still in the process of organization and re-organization.

Thus, it may have taken six days of unknown length to organize the *spiritual* heavens and earth; it may have taken six days of unknown length to *plan* the formation of the *mortal* heavens and earth; but it took only *one* day of unknown length, to do the actual work in the physical, mortal sense: “And the Gods came down and formed these the generations of the heavens and of the earth, when they were formed in *the* day that the Gods formed the earth and the heavens.”⁴

We have, then, *three* different accounts of creation, each one of a different kind or phase: (1) the *spiritual* creation (see Genesis and Moses); (2) the *planning* of the *mortal* creation (see Abraham); and (3) the mortal creation itself (see Genesis, Moses, and Abraham).

All this is to say that the holy scriptures do not tell *how long* the creation was in progress (perhaps we should say: *has been* in progress). All of the evidence seems to indicate that God chooses to use *natural* means to accomplish His works, and does every thing in an *orderly* manner. “Behold, mine house is a house of order, saith the Lord God, and not a house of confusion.”⁵

We cannot, therefore, any longer argue against the scientific dating of the life span of the earth or its life, on the basis of scriptural evidence, because *we have no information from holy writ on this matter*. The scientific theories (interpretations of observed findings) of the length of the time involved in the creations may be fully true and exact, or only partly so, but we cannot argue against them on the basis of what we find in the presently available writings of divinely inspired men; we are without scriptural evidence before we start. We might want to *believe* that God took exactly six thousand years to form the heavens and the earth, but we cannot support our belief with the Word of God—at least, not with that which we now have.

“There is no mystery throughout the whole plan of salvation, only to those who do not understand.”⁶

²Moses 3:4; Genesis 2:4.

³Abraham 5:1-2.

⁴Abraham 5:4.

⁵D.C. 132:8.

⁶*Discourses of Brigham Young*, p 2.

III

WHAT WAS THE ORDER OF THE CREATION?

THE scriptural accounts of the creation of life all give the same order of creation (organization of materials already present)⁷: After the earth itself was formed, and vegetation planted, then "the Gods prepared the waters that they might bring forth great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters were to bring forth abundantly after their kind."⁸ Then came land life: "And the Gods prepared the earth to bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind."⁹ The last and greatest of the creations of God was man himself: "And God created man in his own image."¹⁰

Because of a lack (to date) of sufficient evidence and information from *any* source, it is impossible at present to go into a detailed, step-by-step comparison of the scriptural accounts of the creation with the scientific interpretations of paleontological findings. What we do have, however, admits of no disagreement.

As already stated, the scriptures tell us that, first, the earth and the heavens were formed; second, vegetation was planted; third, marine life came into being; fourth, land and air life came; and, lastly, man—a son of God—crowned the creation by his presence. The scientific findings indicate the same order: first, the earth was formed; second vegetation started (in the waters); third, marine life followed; fourth, land and air life came; and, fifth, man appeared. (see chart)

The Genesis account, as well as that in the Book of Moses, is of the spiritual creation of plant and animal life. The mortal creation of this same life began after Adam had been placed on earth, which fact we find in Genesis 2:19, Abraham 5:20, and Moses 3:19 (quoted): "And out of the ground I, the Lord God, formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air; and commanded that they should come unto Adam (after Adam had been placed in the Garden of Eden), to see what he would call them; and they were also living souls; for I, God, breathed into them the breath of life, and commanded that whatsoever Adam called *every* living creature, that should be the name thereof."¹¹

Thus, we find that after the earth itself was created, Adam was placed on it, "the first flesh upon the earth, the first man also,"¹² then all of life was created and "brought unto Adam."¹³ (This may be — and probably is—figurative, indicating that Adam—Michael—as one of the gods who participated in the creation,¹⁴ was continuing his work of creation. This might further suggest that Adam remained Michael—

⁷*Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, pp 350ff.

⁸Abraham 4:21; Moses 2:20; Genesis 1:20.

⁹Abraham 4:24; Moses 2:24; Genesis 1:24.

¹⁰Genesis 1:27; Abraham 4:26, 27; Moses 3:7.

¹¹Moses 3:19.

¹²Moses 3:7.

¹³Genesis 2:19; Moses 3:19; Abraham 5:20.

¹⁴D.C. 27:11; Journal of Discourses 1:50.

one of the gods—until he followed Eve in the partaking of the forbidden fruit. It seems likely that Adam knew what he was doing in taking the seeds of death into his body, and that only Eve's memory of a spirit state was blotted out. To substantiate this, we read in I Timothy 2:14, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.") Adam was in the Garden of Eden—or at least going to and fro upon this earth—during the entire creation of life, which may have been—and probably was—a long, long time. This gives us the scriptural basis for the most serious of the creation controversies between science and religion. (As we shall see later, we would be far more correct to state that the controversies have been between some men of religion, and some men of science, rather than between "religion" and "science.")

Many scientists suggest that man is simply an animal, and that he evolved from lower animals. This means, of course, that man has the same ancestry as the ape and—still further back in point of time—the same ancestry as all of the contemporaneous animal life upon the earth. As stated above, this is the major—the one really serious—point of controversy between science and religion, and the one in which the holy scriptures give the most complete and most conclusive evidence. Let's carefully examine this evidence.

Adam was personally a son of God, as well as one of those who helped to create the earth.¹⁴ He came from another world when he entered the Garden of Eden (as suggested by Brigham Young¹⁵), and was the first flesh upon the earth,¹⁶ although this flesh was not subject to death until Adam deliberately and willingly followed Eve, and took the forbidden fruit.¹⁷

Adam — with Eve — was on the earth while life here was being formed,¹⁸ as shown above. When the creation had progressed far enough—that is, when the earth was ready for man, then Adam and Eve left the Garden, after having taken into their bodies the seeds of death.¹⁹ Adam was the first man when he was placed on earth, because there were no other men upon it, neither any other life (thus the first flesh also); he was still the first man (true man, son of God), when he left Eden and became the father of us all.

Why was Adam not created mortal (subject to death) in the first place? Probably because he, as one of the gods, had certain creative work to do while on the earth itself as a resident, and, further, he could become mortal only through a free will choice of his own: he had to choose for himself to accept the influence of evil that the bitter might precede the sweet. God the Father could form a tabernacle for the spirit, but Adam had to *choose* to accept it, then *choose* to make it mortal. Only Adam, using his free agency, could take into his body the seeds of death. In the Council in Heaven, Adam accepted the principle of the Plan; when he

¹⁴*Discourses of Brigham Young*, 104; see also *A Rational Theology*, Widdsoe, p 51; Luke 3:38; *Key to Theology*, Pratt, p 55.

¹⁵Moses 3:7.

¹⁷*Articles of Faith*, Talmage, p 475; *Jesus the Christ*, Talmage, pp 18-20; I Timothy 2:14.

¹⁸See the accounts of the creation in Genesis, Moses, and Abraham.

¹⁹*Articles of Faith*, Talmage, pp 67, 476; *Jesus the Christ*, Talmage, pp 29, 30.

ate the forbidden fruit in the Garden of Eden, he *literally* and *actually* accepted the Plan and made it a very real part of himself.

Adam's creation was completed when he freely took the forbidden fruit. Adam, as one of the gods who helped to create the world, performed himself the last act of creation: making man a mortal being, when he made himself mortal. There can be no other ancestry for mortal man than this. Any theory to the contrary is preposterous.

Adam was—and is—a son of God, and could not have been born through earthly parents, because he was in the Garden of Eden before any other life was formed. He stayed in Eden—or at least somewhere upon the earth as a Being not subject to death—until the earth was prepared for mortal men. Then, by a free will choice, he took seeds of death into his body, became mortal, and took his place as the father of the human race. He could have come in no other way. "Intelligence, or the light of truth, was not created or made, neither indeed can be,"²⁰ and only man has this kind of intelligence; only man can inherit intelligence; only man can bestow intelligence.

Can any other form of life hope to become as God is, and have the power to create, in the sense that He has,—other than man himself? No, of course not. "Intelligence, or the light of truth," can be inherited only through the race of beings known as MAN, and only MAN can ever become a GOD, and *only gods can beget gods*.

If so-called pre-historic men were actually pre-historic, or if they were mis-dated (that is, not as old as now thought) descendants of Adam, is of little importance. That they existed, we cannot doubt, because we can see and feel their fossils; but ancestors of Adam they could not possibly have been, because Adam did not come through such a line. If they actually were residents of the earth *before* Adam's transgression in Eden, then perhaps they did not have the God-given intelligence given to Adam. In God's classification, they may simply have been the highest of the animal creations, but not true men because they were not descended from God himself: they were not of the same family as Adam.

Furthermore, many Bible chronologists disagree on the antiquity of Adam. Some say that he lived thousands of years before the commonly accepted date of 4000 B.C. Adam *did* precede the flood, Egypt *was* founded *after* the flood, and archeological findings during the past several decades indicate that Egypt was a flourishing nation probably some time *prior* to 4000 B.C., all of which gives ample evidence that science has much yet to find concerning modern man's past history, and that God has yet to reveal more "light and knowledge" on the same subject.

For our purpose here, then, let us remember this: the scriptures now give us no positive answer to the questions concerning the pre-historic men, only to tell us definitely that *they were not ancestors of Adam*. Furthermore, on the basis of holy writ itself, *there is no disagreement between "science" and "religion" concerning the order of the creation!*

²⁰D.C. 93:29.

A CHRONOLOGY

First Day	Second Day	Third Day	Fourth Day
S P I R I T U A L			
(BOOKS OF GENESIS)			

Earth without form,
and void.
Let there be light!

God made the firmament.

Waters gathered together; dry land;
grass; herbs; fruit trees.

God made two great lights.

T H E P L A N N I N G O F

(BOOK OF

The Gods planned the organization of the earth and light for it.

They planned to form the expanse.

They said: Let the waters be gathered together, and dry land be; let the earth be prepared for vegetation.

The Gods planned to give the earth many lights.

THUS WERE THEIR DECISIONS AT THE TIME THAT THEY COUNSELED AMONG THEMSELVES TO FORM

And the Gods came down and formed these the generations
formed the earth

Inorganic Creation

Organization and re-organization is continuous

Vegetation

← Perhaps back this far

← Perhaps back this far

← 3 (OR MORE)

OF CREATION

Fifth Day	Sixth Day	Seventh Day	Mortal Creation
C R E A T I O N			
AND MOSES)			

Waters brought forth moving creatures; fowl.

God made beasts, cattle, creeping things; man in God's image

God rested.

Mist went up; man formed from dust, Eden planted; beasts and fowl formed out of the ground. Eve given to Adam.

THE MORTAL CREATION

Let us prepare the waters to bring forth every living creature; and every winged fowl.

The earth was to bring forth cattle, and creeping things, and beasts. The Gods said Let us make man in our own image, male and female.

We will rest on the seventh time.

And the Gods watched those things they had ordered until they obeyed.

THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH. (ABRAHAM 5:3)

of the heavens and of the earth in THE DAY that the Gods and the heavens.

Continuous growth and expansion

Marine Life

Continuous growth and expansion

GARDEN OF EDEN

Adam on earth at least during creation of animals

Animal Life

Continuous growth and expansion

Mortal Man

BILLION YEARS ??

Notes on the chart, *CHRONOLOGY OF CREATION*

The Spiritual Creation. The accounts of the creations as found in Genesis and in Moses, which categorize it into definite steps, are of a *spiritual creation*. This is clearly stated in Genesis 2:5, and in Moses 3:5. The six days of creation are days of preparation of spiritual entities which were to inhabit and give life to the mortal individuals to be created later.

Planning the Creation. In the account of the creation found in the Book of Abraham, we have six periods of time, not for a spiritual creation, nor for a mortal creation, but for the *planning* of the major steps to be taken in the organization of a world and heavens. (See Abraham 5:3,5)

Mortal Creation. In Genesis and Moses after the story of the spiritual creation, and in Abraham after the story of the planning of the mortal creation, this mortal creation is spoken of as being accomplished in *one* period of time. (See Genesis 2:4; Moses 3:4; Abraham 5:4) The first life of any kind to be created was Adam (Genesis 2:7; Moses 3:7; Abraham 5:7), and the next was vegetation: the Garden of Eden (Genesis 2:8; Moses 3:8; Abraham 5:8). Adam was the first flesh upon the earth, as well as the first man (Moses 3:7). The rest of the creation followed Adam. However, while Adam was in the Garden of Eden, his body of flesh and bones was not subject to death, being perfect, and being fed by perfect foods. Only after he took a food in which were the seeds of death, did he become mortal (subject to death).

Adam in the Garden of Eden. As stated in the preceding paragraph, Adam was the first flesh upon the earth, and all other creation followed him. He, then, was in the Garden of Eden for a long, long time and, according to Abraham (5:14-19) Eve was with him from the beginning. Adam was Michael, one of the gods who created the earth, (J.D. 1:50), and part of his particular work may well have been to personally supervise the development of life on the earth, for which reason he was placed upon the earth so early, and stayed so long.

Animals Created Mortal. While the first flesh upon the earth was Adam's, and was not subject to death, there is no scriptural evidence that the animal life placed here was also not subject to death. To the contrary, the evidence points to Adam as the exception. Adam was in the Garden of Eden while all the animals were formed and brought to him for naming. If they were subject to death, as seems to be the case, then they certainly must have left some visible traces (fossils) of themselves.

Adam's Ancestry. Adam was—and is—a Son of God. He came down to this earth from another abode, entered the Garden of Eden, took upon himself a body of flesh and bones, remained in a state of semi-mortality (having a body of flesh and bones, which was created perfect and so remained until he took into it the seeds of death) until the earth could support him in mortality, then he took the forbidden fruit—the seeds of death—and became a mortal man: the Father of the human race. He could not possibly have had mortal parents; he could not pos-

sibly have been nothing more than one link in a long chain of mortal evolution.

Mortal Man. Mathematically and scientifically, it is entirely possible and logical that the human race is descended from one father and one mother. The holy scriptures tell us positively that we are all sons and daughters of Adam and Eve, not descended from lower animals.

Prehistoric Men. Either degenerate descendants of Adam, and so misdated by scientists, or the highest of the creations of Christ and Michael and so not true men—not sons of God as was Adam, and so not possessing God-given characteristics of intelligence “or the light of truth.”

Time of the Creation. The age of the earth can be measured only in terms of vast ages of time, not in days, or years, or even centuries. The Lord seems pleased to “let nature take its course.” All of our evidence points to TIME as a very important factor in growth and development of life. (See *Evidences and Reconciliations*, John A. Widtsoe, p 134.)

IV

WHAT METHOD WAS USED IN THE CREATION? JUST HOW DID GOD ORGANIZE THE LIFE ON THIS EARTH UPON WHICH WE LIVE?

COULD it have been that God, from His abode in the heavens, spoke a word of command, then—instantly—the earth was in existence, then another command, and—instantly—an entire group or family of animals was in mortal existence; then another command, and—instantly—another group, and so on until He had completed His work?

If this was the method used, then when man was created—even though the earth was prepared for countless millions of mortal men and women—why did God start out with but two: Adam and Eve? If this method of instantaneous creation was the one which God used, then why is there no apparent evidence of it in all of recorded or unrecorded history, or in all of nature? Could it be, then, that each step of creation had a beginning, and expanded and developed from a very small start, and each new form of life had a foundation upon some bit of life which had already been in existence?

We now know that only life begets life, so where could the very first life upon the earth have come from, if not from another abode of life? Matter cannot be destroyed, nor can it be created from nothing.

Orson Pratt said: "It is strange, that men professedly wise, capable of reason, and common sense, could possibly work up their minds into a belief that human spirits are called into being from nothing at the average rate of about twenty every minute. How much more consistent it is to believe that the substance of our spirits, like the substance of our bodies, had a pre-existence; that both are eternal, and that not one particle of either ever sprang from nothing; that creation signifies organization of pre-existent materials, and not the production of these materials from nothing. The former is a Scriptural truth; the latter a vague, foolish, unphilosophical, absurd speculation of men who believed in an immaterial god "without body or parts," which is equivalent to no god. When will man burst the shell of his traditions, and have common sense! When will he turn from such disgusting absurdities, to the word of God!"²¹

In the scientific laboratory, man can take minute bits of life, place them in environments conducive to growth, watch over them, take out bits of the growth, place these in new environments, add new substances, and thus change the forms of life by *adding* new ones. The original forms need not be entirely used up, yet each new form is based upon a preceding one. Is not this *creation* as we today understand the term: organization from materials already in existence; is not this a *guided evolution*? Would you call the men who perform these experiments creators or organizers, at least in the broad sense of the term? Are they not organizing and re-organizing life from materials already present? Are they not taking advantage of this mortal school?

²¹Masterful Discourses of Orson Pratt, Lundwall, pp 58, 59. See also Key to Theology, Pratt, ch 6; A Rational Theology, Widtsoe, pp 10, 50.

Luther Burbank gave us many new forms of fruits, each new fruit based upon a preceding form, yet quite different. Was he *creating* new forms of life? Many farmers and breeders have given us new forms of horses, cattle and other animals, each new form based upon preceding forms. Are these men learning how to *create*?

Were the new forms they gave us, transplanted from another planet? Were they instantaneous or spontaneous creations? (We would like to suggest still another question, with no attempt to answer it here: Was there a new form of plant or animal in the spirit world waiting to give life to each new form brought about by man's experiments?)

If creation is a never-ending process, then surely it must be in daily operation before our very eyes. We see all about us, every day, the laws of evolution in operation. We are not identically the same as our parents; they are not the identical image of their parents. Every man living today has descended not only from his immediate parents, but from a long list of progenitors back as far as Adam. Each individual is an entirely separate and distinct being, yet dependent upon a previous being for his existence. The differences between races, body forms, color, etc., etc., are results of the operation of the laws of evolution. Only Adam had no *mortal* parents, because he was on the earth before any other life was created, but he *did* have parents,—resurrected beings who themselves had once been mortal, and still had the power of procreation.²²

We have already suggested that the *first* life, at least, came from another planet or world;¹⁵ we know that *we* can change the form (in the offspring) of some plants and animals; and we know that only life can beget life, and that all life as we see it upon the earth now, came from some *other* life on earth *which we also saw*. We see before our very eyes a process of growth and development which we have arbitrarily called evolution. Furthermore, we believe that *every* thing, individually and collectively, that is in existence about us, is further evidence of the existence and of the working of God. How much longer are we going to be blinded by tradition, and fail to use our God-given faculties in our search for truth?

Perhaps evolution was not the one and only method that God used to fill the earth with the variety of life which has existed here, but it seems likely that it was an important method, and because of the abundant evidence about us, we should consider it seriously, and not cast it aside lightly, because we cannot find in the holy scriptures sufficient evidence on the method of creation to refute present scientific claims on this matter. We must, then, both look to science for help in finding the answers, and wait for further light and knowledge from God.²³

Perhaps we are too prone to place God's activities in another sphere of existence and, because of our own lack of information and understanding, limit Him to that work which is far beyond our own experience, when actually He is active in *all* phases of *all* life. He can do all that we can do, plus a vast amount of other work which we are just barely beginning to learn how to do. Our pin-point view of some of the workings of creation (if we actually are somewhere near being correct in

²²Teachings of Prophet Joseph Smith, Smith, pp 342ff.

²³See the 9th Article of Faith.

our thinking thus far) serves to give us a far greater appreciation for God's powers of organization, His understanding of the multitudinous details of construction, His fine sense of balances and contemporaneous necessities, His knowledge and skill as a Planner and a Builder, His wisdom as a Teacher, and His love as a Father. Small of mind and heart indeed is the man who can get even the faintest glimpse of God's manifest works, and yet fail to feel closer to his Father. Most assuredly, our Father in heaven is, even now, continuing His guiding influence in the universe and on the earth we are a part of.

In any event, at least on the basis of scriptural evidence, "religion" cannot disagree with "science" on the matter of the method of the creation!